

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 28 2009

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests substantive examination of the application in view of the following remarks.

In response to the allegation that the claims of this application constitute more than "a single general inventive concept" under PCT rule 13.1 because they lack the same or corresponding special technical features under PCT rule 13.2 (see MPEP 1850), and the requirement under 37 CFR 1.499, that applicant elect a single invention to which prosecution will be restricted, applicant hereby elects the invention of group I described in the office action as consisting of claims 2-6, 20 and 29. Applicant traverses the requirement because the claims of all the groups have the same distinguishing features, so that any reasonable search of one group of claims will be sufficient for examining the other groups of claims, so that there is no legal reason that the examiner should insist on restriction.

In response to the requirement for an election of species under PCT rule 13.1-2, as far as applicant understands the requirement, applicant hereby elects the species identified in the Office Action as species "1). The second optical element being a wire grid polarizer.". Claims 1-10, 16-26 and 29-36 are generic to all the species. Claims 11-12, 15, and 27-28 are contained in the elected species, and claims 13-14 are contained in species that were not elected.

The elected claims are in condition for allowance and applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims.

Please charge any fee deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael E. Belk/
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Senior Attorney
(914) 333-9643